

### REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 26, 2003 (Paper No. 12). Claims 1 to 25 remain in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 21 and 23 to 25, the independent claims herein, have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

It is noted that this amendment has been prepared in accordance with the Patent Office's revised format for amendments and therefore, where appropriate, waiver of the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her indication that the previous objections to the drawings and specification have been withdrawn. However, it is noted that the current Office Action erroneously indicates that new formal drawings or a proposed drawing correction is required. It is believed that this requirement is merely a typographical error and that no drawing corrections are required since the previous objections to the drawings were addressed by amendment to the specification. Therefore, no new drawings or proposed corrections are being submitted herewith. Nonetheless, clarification of the requirement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18, 19, and 21 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,911,044 (Lo) in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0059362 (Maeda), Claims 3 and 9 were rejected over Lo in view of Maeda and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,223 (Kumpf), Claims 6, 15, 16, 17 and 20 were rejected over Lo in view of Maeda and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,168,444 (Cukor), and Claims 12, 13 and 14 were rejected over Lo in view of Maeda and Cukor and in further view of Kumpf. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention as defined in Claim 1 concerns a system for fulfilling a scan order. According to the invention, the system includes at least one computer terminal, at least one order entry server, and at least one scanner node. Each computer terminal can send a scan order to an order entry server, where the scan order includes at least one network address, input by a requester, to which a scanned image is to be sent. The order entry server creates and distributes the scan order to at least one scanner. The scanner receives and processes the scan order, including generating a scanned image and sending the scanned image to the network address included in the received scan order. Thus, a requestor can enter a scan order at the computer terminal such that the scan order is sent over the network and is fulfilled by a scanner via the order entry server, with a scanned image being generated and sent to a network address input by the requestor as part of the scan order. As a result, there is no need for a user to input a destination address of a scanned image at the scanner, but rather, the requestor merely enters the network address in the scan order at the computer terminal.

With specific reference to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a computer network scanning system for fulfilling a scan order over a computer network, the system comprising at least one computer terminal adapted to receive input for creating the scan order and sending the scan order to an order entry server, the scan order including at least one network address to which a scanned image is to be sent, the address being input by a requestor, at least one order entry server computer configured to receive the scan order from the computer terminal and to create and distribute scan orders to at least one scanner node, each order entry server computer being coupled to the at least one computer terminal through the computer network, and at least one scanner node, each scanner node being coupled to the at least one computer terminal and each order entry server computer through

the computer network, each scanner node being configured to receive and process scan orders sent to the scanner node by at least one of the order entry servers, and each scanner node being configured to generate a scanned image based on the received scan order and to send the scanned image to the network address included in the received scan order.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claim 1. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a computer terminal, coupled to a scanner node via a computer network, adapted to receive input for creating a scan order and sending the scan order to an order entry server, the scan order including at least one network address to which a scanned image is to be sent, the address being input by a requestor, where the scanner node receives and processes the scan order to generate a scanned image based on the received scan order and to send the scanned image to the network address included in the received scan order.

The Office Action admits that Lo fails “to disclose at least one computer terminal adapted to receive input including [an] address for sending scanned image, the address being input by a requester.” Thus, Lo also fails to disclose or to suggest a scanner node that receives and processes the scan order to generate a scanned image based on the received scan order and to send the scanned image to the network address, which is input by the requester at the computer terminal coupled to the scanner node via the network, included in the received scan order. Accordingly, Lo fails to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of Claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that Maeda teaches “at least one computer terminal adapted to receive input including any address for sending scanned image, the address being input by a requestor. (pg. 2, section 0026 and pg. 4, section 0089 and Fig. 2,

reference S201 of Maeda).” However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assessment of Maeda.

As shown in Figures 1 and 2, Maeda discloses a transmission apparatus 1 that sends a scanned image via e-mail to a receiving apparatus 2. The transmission apparatus 1 includes a scanner 6 for scanning an image and sending the scanned image to a given destination (the receiving apparatus). The destination is input at the transmission apparatus 1, which includes the scanner. Thus, the transmission apparatus 1, by having the scanner incorporated therein, is at best seen to correspond to a scanner node that scans a document and transmits the scanned document to a destination address, which is input at the scanner node itself. Nowhere is Maeda seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a computer terminal, coupled to a scanner node via a computer network, adapted to receive input for creating a scan order and sending the scan order to an order entry server, the scan order including at least one network address to which a scanned image is to be sent, the address being input by a requestor at the computer terminal.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Lo and Maeda.

Turning now to independent Claims 7, 21, 23, 24 and 25, the present invention creates a scan order at a local computer terminal, wherein the scan order includes an identification of an item to be scanned and an address of at least one of the individuals selected from a group comprising (A) recipients of the scanned document, and (B) recipients of notification of completion of the scan order, wherein the recipients of notification of completion of the scan order may comprise individuals other than a requestor that initiates the scan order. As a result of the foregoing, the requestor that

initiates the scan order can have a notification sent to third party individuals that the scan order has been completed.

Thus, with specific reference to the claims, amended independent Claim 7 is a computer network scanning method for fulfilling a scan order over a computer network having at least one scanner node, the method comprising creating the scan order at a local computer terminal, wherein the scan order includes an identification of an item to be scanned and an address of at least one of the individuals selected from the group comprising (A) recipients of the scanned document, and (B) recipients of notification of completion of the scan order, wherein the recipients of notification of completion of the scan order may comprise individuals other than a requestor that initiates the scan order, submitting the scan order to at least one scanner node for processing, processing the scan order at the scanner node, and updating the scanner node(s) on the computer network.

Amended independent Claims 21 and 23 to 25, while varying in scope from Claim 7, nonetheless include features substantially corresponding to those of Claim 7.

The applied art, alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 7, 21 and 23 to 25. More particularly, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of creating a scan order at a local computer terminal, wherein the scan order includes an identification of an item to be scanned and an address of recipients of notification of completion of the scan order which may comprise individuals other than a requestor that initiates the scan order.

The Office Action admits that Lo fails to disclose “selection of individuals from a group”, and therefore, Lo does not disclose or suggest the foregoing features of Claims 7, 21 and 23 to 25.

Maeda merely discloses that a image processing confirmation message is transmitted by the receiving apparatus to the transmission apparatus. (See Figs. 3, 7 and 11, and page 2, at 0028, page 5, and at 0095 to 0099.) Thus, Maeda merely generates a transmission confirmation message on the receiving side and transmits the message (via e-mail) back to the transmission apparatus. As such, Maeda merely selects the recipient of the message in the receiving side and then transmits the message to the sending device, but does not, and cannot, send the message to recipients other than the requestor that initiates the scan order.

Moreover, in Maeda, the scan order is created in the transmission apparatus and it is not seen where in Maeda that the scan order created in the transmission apparatus selects recipients of the notification. In fact, Applicants fail to see anything in Maeda in which, when the scan order is created in the transmission apparatus, an option is selected to provide the confirmation message to the transmission apparatus or to anyone else. Rather, it appears that the confirmation message is merely part of the standard process in Maeda that is performed by the receiving side, regardless of any input of recipients at the transmission side. Accordingly, Maeda is not seen to add anything to overcome the deficiencies of Lo and is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of creating a scan order at a local computer terminal, wherein the scan order includes an identification of an item to be scanned and an address of recipients of notification of completion of the scan order which may comprise individuals other than a requestor that initiates the scan order.

Kumpf and Cukor have been studied but are not seen to add anything to overcome the deficiencies of Lo and Maeda and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a computer terminal, coupled to a scanner node via a computer network, adapted to receive input for creating a scan order and sending the scan

order to an order entry server, the scan order including at least one network address to which a scanned image is to be sent, the address being input by a requestor, where the scanner node receives and processes the scan order to generate a scanned image based on the received scan order and to send the scanned image to the network address included in the received scan order (Claim 1), or at least the feature of creating a scan order at a local computer terminal, wherein the scan order includes an identification of an item to be scanned and an address of recipients of notification of completion of the scan order which may comprise individuals other than a requestor that initiates the scan order (Claims 7, 21 and 23 to 25).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

As a formal matter, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for returning, with the February 26, 2003 Office Action, a Form PTO-1449 from the December 11, 2002 Information Disclosure Statement. However, Applicant notes the Form PTO-1449 included two pages and only the first page was initialed and returned with the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner initial the appropriate portion of page 2 of the Form PTO-1449 to indicate that the documents listed thereon have been considered and to return the initialed form to Applicant with the next communication. For the Examiner's convenience, a copy of page 2 of the Form PTO-1449 is enclosed.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 65122 v 1